



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/485,903	03/31/2000	CHRISTINE DUPUIS	05725.0532	7762

22852 7590 03/14/2006

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

KANTAMNENI, SHOBHA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1617

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/485,903	Applicant(s) DUPUIS ET AL.	
	Examiner Shobha Kantamneni	Art Unit 1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-26,28-36 and 40-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) NONE is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-26,28-36 and 40-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the remarks and amendment filed on 12/14/2005.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/14/2005 has been entered.

The amendment filed on 12/14/2005 amended claims 18, 40, and 43.

Applicant's amendment by incorporating new limitation into the independent claims 18, 40, and 43 overcomes the rejection of claims 18-26, 28-32, 35, 36, and 40-48 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-8 and 35-44 of U.S. Patent No. 6,165,446.

Claims 18-26, 28-36, and 40-48 are pending, and examined herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18-26, 28-36, and 40-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feder et al. (US 5,721,026, of record) in view of both Dubief et al. (US 6,024,946, of record), and Bolich (EP 0 240 349, of record).

Feder et al. discloses a composition comprising aqueous silicone dispersion comprising (a) an oil-in-water emulsion of an α,ω -dihydroxypoly-diorganosiloxane (a non-aminated α,ω -disilanol), (b) an aqueous dispersion of an insoluble organic (co)polymer particles having a particle size ranging from 0.01 to 0.5 μm , in an amount of 20 to 70 % by weight comprising monomer units selected from alkyl(meth)acrylates (such as butyl acrylate, methyl methacrylate, etc.), unsaturated esters of monocarboxylic acids, vinylaromatic compounds (such as styrene, 4- methylstyrene, etc.), unsaturated carboxylic acids (such as acrylic acid, etc.) and others. See abstract; column 23-24, claims 19, 28; column 5, line 19-column 6, line 38. It is also taught that aqueous dispersion contain particle size ranging from 0.15 μm to 100 μm originating from emulsion of α,ω -dihydroxypoly-diorganosiloxane. See column 7, lines 15-17. Feder et al. teaches that the dispersions disclosed therein can be useful as cosmetic compositions for the treatment of hair, especially for achieving permanent waving. See col. 11 , lines 6-13.

Feder et al. does not teach propellants, and a percent of weight of non-aminated α,ω -disilanol as ranging from 0.05 to 10 % by weight.

Feder et al. does not specifically teach a hair setting lotion, and a process of rinsing the hair.

Art Unit: 1617

Dubief et al. teaches a composition for the treatment of keratinous materials consisting essentially of an aqueous medium, at least one silicone, at least one latex consisting colloid suspension of polymer particles insoluble in said aqueous medium, and at least one suspension agent for the silicone and the latex and/or at least one thickening agent (Abstract). Specifically disclosed is a non-rinsed conditioner comprising an o/w emulsion of acrylamide/sodium 2-methyl propanesulfonate acrylamide copolymer, a latex of vinyl acetate/acrylic ester copolymer, and a mixture of octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane dimethiconol and dodecamethylcyclopentasiloxane (col. 8, Example 1). The silicones comprise 0.1-50% of the composition and the latex polymer particles comprise 3.1-10% of the composition (col. 7, lines 26-36). Propellants are disclosed as additives (col. 7, lines 48-53). The compositions may be used as a rinsed or non-rinsed treatment lotion for application before or after shampooing, before or after perming, before or after dyeing or bleaching or between two perming or straightening steps (col. 7, lines 57-61).

Dubief et al. does not teach the amount of propellant as ranging from 15 to 35 % by weight.

Dubief also does not teach the particular propellants such as n-butane, propane, isobutene, pentane etc as in claim 34.

Bolich teaches an aerosol hair cosmetic aqueous composition comprising a silicone elastomer, a propellant and, optionally, a hair setting polymer dispersible in an aqueous phase. See Abstract; page 2, lines 40-50; page 3, lines 18-39. It is taught that the propellant generally makes up 3-30% w/w of the composition (preferably about 5-

Art Unit: 1617

15% w/w), and that it may be propane, n-butane, dimethylether, etc. See page 3, lines 3-16.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to employ the percent weight of silicone as from about 0.05 to 10 % into the invention of Feder et al. because (1) Dubief et al. teaches ranges of silicone and polymer particle weight percentages that either encompass or overlap with the percentages of the claims of the instant invention, and (2) it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to prepare a composition of Feder et al. with the weight percentages of Dubief et al. because of an expectation of success in preparing a hair cosmetic composition capable of the treatment of hair because (1) Feder et al. and Dubief et al. are both drawn to compositions comprising similar components (such as an aqueous component, a silicone component, a polymer particle component, etc); (2) both Feder et al. and Dubief et al. teach that the compositions therein are useful for treating hair.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to employ a propellant in the composition of Feder because Dubief teaches analogous formulations, useful for treating hair containing additives such as propellants.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the specific weight percentages of the specific propellants as claimed in the instant invention because it is taught by Bolich that aqueous hair cosmetics comprising a silicone

Art Unit: 1617

elastomer and a hair setting polymer may be aerosolized and contain a propellant, preferably 5-15 %. Accordingly, Bolich teaches an analogous art comprising the instant specific propellants within the amount ranges as claimed in the instant application. One would have been motivated to add a propellant in the weight percentage of the instant application to the composition of Feder et. al. because, as taught by Bolich, such preparations are useful as hair styling mousses. See page 2, lines 1-3.

It is noted that the claims of the instant application are directed to a composition comprising an aqueous dispersion comprising at least one insoluble polymer particle, an emulsion comprising 0.05-10% non-aminated silicone -disilanol, 15-35% propellant, and a cosmetically acceptable medium, wherein the composition is in the form of an aerosol. Any properties exhibited by or benefits provided by the composition are inherent and are not given patentable weight over the prior art. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure or composition, the properties Applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See MPEP 2112.01. The burden is shifted to Applicant to show that the prior art product does not possess the same properties of the instant claimed product. The prior art teaches applicant to keratinous substances, such as hair, of compositions containing the same components as instantly claimed, which would necessarily possess the property of being a hair-setting lotion, as instantly claimed. Applicant has not provided any evidence of record to show that the prior art composition does not exhibit the same properties as those instantly claimed.

Conclusion


No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shobha Kantamneni whose telephone number is 571-272-2930. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7.30am-4.00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shobha Kantamneni
Patent Examiner
Art Unit : 1617



SREENI PADMANABHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER